

134

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP-6826-2024
Date of decision: 21.03.2024

Rajeshwar Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

District Registrar of Societies Kurukshetra and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari so as to declare notice dated 13.01.2024 (Annexure P-10) and proceeding/resolution dated 27.01.2024 (Annexure P-15) and notice dated 27.01.2024 (Annexure P-13) as null and void.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that on 30.01.2024, the petitioner had filed the petition (Annexure P-16) for declaring the meeting resolution passed on 27.01.2024 and 28.01.2024 as illegal and against law and had also filed the stay application (Annexure P-17) along with the said petition. It is further submitted that reply to the said petition as well as the stay application has already been filed by both the

respondents in the said petition and the case is now fixed for 27.03.2024. It is also submitted that the petitioner at this stage, would be making a limited prayer to the effect that the stay application filed by the petitioner, in which both the parties have been served, be decided on 27.03.2024 or in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that in case the respondents have appeared in the case and the matter is fixed for 27.03.2024 then, every endeavour would be made by respondent No.1 to decide the stay application on 27.03.2024 or within a period of two weeks from 27.03.2024.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.1 to decide the application for stay (Annexure P-17), in case pleadings in the same are complete, on 27.03.2024 or within a period of two weeks from 27.03.2024 after hearing all the concerned parties, in accordance with law.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.1 would independently consider the stay application, in accordance with law.

6. It would be open to respondent No.1 to even decide the main appeal within the aforesaid period.

21.03.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- **Yes/No**

Whether reportable:- **Yes/No**